

commenting upon the matter at the opening of the season, and it is one worthy the attention of all lovers of *bona fide* out-door sport. Roughness and wildness in play and language redolent of the fish-market are sufficient to render any game unpopular.

IF the forthcoming three days' cricket match between an English and a Canadian team is not an unqualified success, the meddling grumblers who have aired their crotchets in the columns of the Toronto press will be solely to blame—providing always that the weather is favourable. For many reasons—chief amongst them no doubt the “barbarianisms” accompanying lacrosse and base-ball—there is a growing interest in cricket, and its devotees claim that the time is not far distant when it will take its place here, as in England, as the king of out-door games.

THERE is no more objectionable feature about journalism than the personalities which too often characterize it. Not even the vulgar language used by party hacks brings greater discredit upon the press. The sentiments expressed in editorial columns are, in well-regulated communities, tacitly understood to be endorsed by the whole *personnel* of the journal in which they appear, by gentlemen are treated as such, and are not attributed to any particular writer. Only on such lines can a publication attain dignity; only on such terms will writers who are worth reading connect themselves with the press. We have had occasion to refer to this matter before, and to request offenders to quote what appears in THE WEEK as of THE WEEK, and not as of this or that contributor. In some cases our hint has been taken; in others, we regret to say, it has not. A few persons, apparently having conceived themselves outside ordinary social courtesies and professional honour, persist in attributing articles to some individual writer—usually the wrong one. There is no pretence that this line of action assists to a better understanding of the subject under discussion; it is done with the sole idea of annoyance, and is the instinct of a blackguard. The following rebuke, administered by the Halifax *Critic* to the Nova Scotia *Herald* for an offence of this scandalous nature, may prove profitable reading to those who thus disregard journalistic decency: “We really must decline to discuss any question whatever with the *Herald* if it is going to attribute our editorial remarks by name to this or that writer, supposed to be connected with this paper. To every journal belongs the responsibility for its editorials. For any editorial of the *Critic* that ‘incorporeal entity’ called the *Critic* ought to be praised or blamed. It is among the unique journalistic methods of our contemporary to attribute any distasteful remarks in the *Recorder* and the *Chronicle* respectively to Hon. J. W. Longley and the Provincial Secretary. We do not wish to imitate or to encourage this unconventional style of journalism, and we are glad to say that we have no inclination and no facilities for prying into the authorship of the editorials in our contemporaries.”

THERE were eight failures in Canada reported to Bradstreet's during the past week, against nineteen in the preceding week, and fourteen, twenty-two and thirteen in the corresponding weeks of 1884, 1883 and 1882, respectively. In the United States there were one hundred and forty-six failures reported during the week as compared with one hundred and eighty in the preceding week, and with one hundred and sixty-nine, one hundred and twenty-six and one hundred and ten, respectively, in the corresponding weeks of 1884, 1883 and 1882. About eighty-two per cent. were those of small traders whose capital was less than \$5,000.

It is singular that religious journals which applauded as morally wholesome the obscene revelations of the *Pall Mall Gazette* and impugned the moral principles of those who took the other view, should object to the catechizings of the confessional as a polluted introduction to evil. The Roman Catholic priesthood, it seems to us, may make great capital out of the conduct of Protestant journals and clergymen on this occasion.

THE following are the reflections of Charles de Mazade, the writer of the “Chronicle” of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, on the Salisbury Government. The writer is a close observer of English politics and, like the *Revue* itself, a decided Conservative.

On a near view this seems a strange Ministry. It has certainly not come into power under favourable conditions as regards foreign affairs, and it cannot reckon upon gaining a hold upon public opinion by brilliant successes. It begins, at any rate, it must be confessed, by acts of singular rashness; it seems bent on astonishing England by the suddenness of its evolutions. The Conservatives of the new Ministry are doing now what Lord Beaconsfield did in former days with an audacious dexterity. They are trying to wrest the weapons out of the hands of their opponents by showing themselves more liberal than the Liberals, particularly in their Irish policy. They are going the length of a sort of semi-socialist radicalism in the hope of capturing the Irish vote, first in Parliament and afterwards in the elections. Mr. Gladstone, in spite of his bold and well-attested liberalism, had been compelled, in presence of the most frightful crimes, to have recourse to the strongest measures of repression; and the last Viceroy of Ireland, Lord Spencer, had persistently demanded the retention of those laws. The new Ministry inaugurates a policy of non-interference without limit; it almost disavows the repressive measures of former days, and it even consents to a revision of the decisions given in criminal cases in the interest of the Irish, and that agrarian measure seemed bold enough in all conscience. The present Ministry brings forward in the Upper House a Bill to facilitate the purchase of land with money advanced by the State. Strange to say it is the Liberals to-day that are accusing the Conservatives of attacking the right of property by their legislation. Has the new ministry reason to hope that by these means it will at any rate win the sympathies and the votes of the Irish? It will perhaps gain the momentary support of tacticians like Mr. Parnell, though even Mr. Parnell and his friends have recently voted against it. The agitators who lead the Irish are not contented with these concessions; they look for a speedy and gratuitous distribution of the land, and the Ministry runs great risk of gaining nothing by its wild and spasmodic liberalism. It is making an experiment which it may find hazardous enough for its party as well as for England herself, with its Tory democracy, and one which, without reconciling Ireland, may certainly give birth to perils of other kinds.

THE *Mail* concedes to the electors of Northampton the right to choose their own parliamentary representatives, but does so grudgingly and in terms which for indecency were probably never equalled by Mr. Bradlaugh. That notorious non-jurist may—indeed does—hold views with which neither the *Mail* nor THE WEEK can have any sympathy; but in expressing them he is neither “blatant,” “coarse,” nor “vulgar.” On the contrary, his delivery and his writings are usually calm and judicial in tone, and his language is never disfigured by the use of gratuitous insults such as are used by the *Mail's* writer. It is difficult to characterize in proper terms the assertion that a majority of the Northampton electors are “brutalized,” and the still more contemptible comparison of Jews, Dissenters and Roman Catholics with “lepers.” Champions such as this it is which bring discredit upon Christianity.

“*Sic vos non vobis*” may be said of inventions as a rule. Howe, of sewing-machine fame, Bessemer, and Stephenson certainly reaped the benefit of their respective discoveries; but, as a rule, inventors, like sheep, are shorn; like bees, robbed of their honey; and Dr. R. H. Gilbert, who died recently in New York, was no exception to a too-general rule. He invented the Elevated Railroad system, which, as visitors to New York may remember, gives you such an admirable idea of the inner life of the streets you pass through. Dr. Gilbert was made chief inspecting engineer to his own railway; but as the company infringed his rights, he sought the aid of the law. A compromise was effected, and he received \$100,000 in shares. But as the stock paid no dividend, he lived and died no better off for his invention, which we trust may never be introduced into Canada.

ACCORDING to the French authorities our old friend the sardine is in a bad way. At Concarneau and other places on the coast of Brittany where sardines most do—or rather did—congregate, they have grown exceedingly shy and congregate in much smaller numbers. The fishermen of Concarneau are almost starving, the factories are being closed, and only a few of the establishments possessed of large capital can hold on. The fishermen who can hire steam power, and thus get further out to sea, are able to catch a few fish, but they assure the visitor that sardines are no longer what they used to be, either in numbers or quality. This decline is by some attributed to the failure of cod roe, which is the most attractive bait for sardines. Others fall back upon the Gulf Stream which, it is said, has been diverted from its old course, and the fish who like its warmth have followed it. Whatever the true explanation may be, sardines are declining in numbers. We do not know whether the consumer is equally deserving of compassion. Sprats we always have with us, and although there are doubtless experts who know a sprat from a sardine, the vast majority of the public are obliged to take tinned sardines on trust. The *dictum* laid down by Sam Weller in his famous discourse on meat pies may be very safely extended to other comestibles: “It's the seasoning as does it.”

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### TO READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

All communications intended for the Editor must be addressed: EDITOR OF THE WEEK, 5 Jordan Street, Toronto.

Contributors who desire their MS. returned, if not accepted, must enclose stamp for that purpose.

FIDELIS.—The substance of your communication having appeared in the daily papers, it has lost its interest for our readers.

### THE NATURAL LAW IN THE SPIRITUAL WORLD.

To the Editor of The Week:

SIR,—Your very forcible and just criticism of Mr. Drummond's “Natural Law in the Spiritual World” reveals the weak point of that ingenious book; but it is only fair to the author to remember that he himself looks upon his whole scheme as merely tentative. In fact, his own spiritual system is evidently undergoing metamorphosis. Deeply religious, and brought up, one would judge, “after the most straitest sect” of Predestinarianism or Puritanism, he is at the same time a man of brilliant scientific attainments, and a proponent of the doctrine of Evolution, which is rapidly becoming accepted by scientific men everywhere, and even by theologians like Bishop Temple. In collating his religious and his scientific views he finds the former gradually, almost imperceptibly, undergoing change. He tells us this in his preface: “The crystals of former doctrine were dissolved, and as they precipitated themselves once more in definite forms I observed that the crystalline system was changed” (p. vii). “My spiritual world before was a chaos of facts: my theology a Pythagorean system” (p. x). “I felt it to be due . . . to begin again at the beginning and reconstruct my spiritual world step by step. The result of that enquiry I have not given in this book” (p. xii).

The whole preface reads like the plaintive confession of one who is not at all satisfied as yet even with his own attempt to reconcile Science with Religion; and, without being a prophet, one may venture to prognosticate that if, as we must hope, the gifted author favours the world with another work, we shall see a still further reconstruction of those religious opinions which with him are confessedly in a state of flux. He will no doubt be himself struck with the vast discrepancy between the Natural Law of Biogenesis and his (Predestinarian or Puritan) view of the Spiritual Law of Regeneration. The Natural Law is universal and constant; the Spiritual Law, from his point of view, acts fortuitously and fitfully.

Now I hope it will not be put down to “priestly pretensions,” “High Church arrogance,” in all that sort of thing, if, as a “High Anglican,” I venture to suggest that Mr. Drummond's difficulties would vanish if he could regard Christianity, not from his Puritan standpoint, but from the “Catholic” one. His beautiful work, for such it is in spite of its incompleteness, has been a great boon to Christian thought, and has thrown much light on the religious problems of the day. At least his lucid descriptions of the Natural Law suggest many analogies in the Spiritual World which the author himself,